

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
October 6, 2008**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:

<http://fp.arizona.edu/senate/minutes.htm>

Visit the faculty governance webpage at:

<http://fp.arizona.edu/senate/>

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert P. Mitchell at 3:06 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 164.

Present: Senators Antin, Bergsma, Bieda, Bruce, Burd, Christenson, Connally, Conway, Cuello, Cusanovich, Dahlgran, A. Davis, O. Davis, Effken, Estrada, Foley, Fregosi, Green, Gruener, Guertin, Hay, Howell, Hyne, Jull, Kovach, McKean, Mitchell, Mutchler, Nolan, Nystedt, Ogden, Ozkan, Renger, Sarid, Schlager, Shelton, Silverman, Slugocki, Smith, Songer, St. John, Sterling, Strittmatter, Talenfeld, Willerton, Witte and Zedeno. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Aleamoni, D. Davis, Garcia, Hildebrand, Jones, Mitchneck, Pintozzi, Ruiz, San Martin, Spece, Tabor and Ulreich.

2. OPEN SESSION

Representing the English Graduate Students' Union, Ryan Paul expressed graduate students' request that managing graduate teaching assistants' workloads and improving educational and research quality should be a primary focus of the UA Transformation restructuring plans.

3. REPORTS

ASUA President Tommy Bruce

ASUA President Bruce announced that the "UA Votes 2008" campaign is continuing its mission to register and educate voters and to provide an early polling place in the ASUA office which will be open to all Pima County registered voters weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., beginning October 8 through the 31st. ASUA will also transport voters to and from the polls on election day. President Shelton and Provost Hay will hold a Town Hall meeting for undergraduate and graduate students to gather student input about the UA Transformation this coming Wednesday.

3B. GPSC President Stephen Bieda

GPSC President Stephen Bieda thanked President Shelton for participating in GPSC's highly successful blood drive last week. He also announced that the special elections for unfilled seats in the Graduate and Professional Student Council from Eller non-MBA and the College of Fine Arts were held last week. The COFA election ended in a tie so a run-off election is being held. He welcomed Jennifer Cruz as the new Eller representative. On October 24-25, beside the Main Library on the mall, GPSC will again host "Student Showcase." Student Showcase represents the academic portion of Homecoming and is an exhibit of undergraduate and graduate student research projects. Applications for projects are still being accepted. Graduate student representatives recently met with Arizona Board of Regents President Fred Boice to request that ABOR's parameters for graduate student tuition be similar to those for undergraduate resident tuition. GPSC is working with ASUA on a press release about the UA Transformation, specifically to address TA workloads, class sizes, and cuts to academic units.

3C. Faculty Officers' Report

Chair of the Faculty Wanda H. Howell extended her thanks to the many Faculty Senators who accepted her request to become Faculty Mentors to new freshmen enrolled in the Arizona Assurance Scholars program which helps low-income, academically-qualifying students to graduate from the UA without incurring debt. Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell welcomed three newly-appointed ASUA Senators Hyne, Nystedt, and Slugocki and five newly-elected Faculty Senate College representatives: Senator Antin from the College of Medicine, Senator Guertin from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Senators Jull and Tabor from the College of Science, and Senator Ogden from the College of Engineering. Next month the Senate will add several more new Senators for the three At-Large Senate positions, for which an online election is currently being conducted. He reminded faculty to please vote by logging into Employee Link with their NetID and password and clicking on "Vote Now." He also announced that the online election to approve the changes to the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws will begin October 14th

and run through the 28th. Presiding Officer Mitchell invited President Shelton, Provost Hay, and Chair of the Faculty Howell to join him in signing the UA's "Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding: Guidelines for Shared Governance." Vice Chair Mitchell informed the Senate that this SGMOU signing ceremony is one that every President, Provost, Chair, and Vice Chair of the Faculty have participated in since 1995.

3D. Provost Meredith Hay

Provost Hay announced that the timeline for the UA Transformation white papers is posted on the Provost's webpage and that her goal is to communicate as much information as early as possible in order to gather feedback from the campus community and our external constituencies. The three-page white papers are due October 13th, and should provide an outline of the major ideas. The proposals will be posted to the Provost's website and a subcommittee of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee will have 2.5 weeks to review and provide summary responses on conflicting proposals, duplications, and the positive and negative impacts of each proposal. The President and Provost will then decide which proposals to move forward to the next stage. Provost Hay said the Transformation is fundamentally about excellence and that the most important part of the process is to allow faculty input. She acknowledged that the short timeline is creating anxiety among some members of the campus community. She emphasized that the first phase is primarily structural, such as reorganizing colleges or reorganizing units within the colleges. Hopefully those proposals will be presented to the Senate by December. The second phase will involve working out the details of implementation of those proposals including curriculum redesign to capitalize on faculty time for teaching and research. She added that Fall 2009 course scheduling will be set in January and probably will not be affected much by the Transformation.

3E. President Robert N. Shelton

President Shelton thanked the faculty members and leaders who have been actively participating in the UA Transformation process. His administration is looking very carefully at the entire fiscal profile of the UA, which includes \$418M a year from the state. The Regents have set the tuition parameters for the coming year; they will set the tuition in December. External fundraising is another aspect of the UA's financial profile; UA has added sixteen endowed chairs in the past two years. Now in its first year, the Arizona Assurance Plan is funding 598 students, 57% of which are first generation college students with about the same percentage representing diverse backgrounds. President Shelton thanked Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell for recruiting faculty mentors for these scholars. President Shelton informed the Senate that there is \$68M in building renewal, maintenance, renovation, and new construction projects ready to begin immediately on UA's campus. The state legislature did approve the \$1B Stimulus Plan for Economic and Educational Development (SPEED), which provides for \$1B in bonding authority for these projects. Before any bonds can be sold, however, the proposals must be reviewed by the Legislature's Joint Committee on Capital Review (JCCR). That committee met last week and declined to review the proposals, and even declined to review the residence hall proposals, even though there is no relation to state indebtedness at all for those buildings.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEM 3

Senator Estrada asked what will happen to white paper proposals that do not go forward to the next phase. Provost Hay answered that not all proposals will go forward. Some proposals will need more work, but if SPBAC does not believe an idea has a good chance of being successful in advancing the goals of the University and the Transformation, it will not be advanced.

Senator Sterling asked whether central administration will be transformed as well. President Shelton responded that he and the Provost's office have asked all units that report to him to examine where they can be leaner and to cut back on things they don't need to do.

Senator McKean asked whether all of the white papers will be posted to the Provost's website. Provost Hay responded that yes, they absolutely will be posted, hopefully by the end of the day on Monday, October 13th.

Senator Silverman asked whether people will be able to comment on the white papers, either online or to a SPBAC member. Provost Hay explained that the process is transparent but the President and Provost will not be asking for comments at this time because it would be too difficult to manage or respond to the comments. The SPBAC subcommittee will review each proposal and provide initial feedback and recommendations.

Senator Songer asked whether this process provides any more opportunities for faculty input. Provost Hay responded that there will be six weeks allowed for tremendous faculty input on the proposals that are suggested to go forward.

Senator A. Davis asked whether a white paper that doesn't reflect the majority of that unit's faculty constituency would be allowed to go forward. Provost Hay remarked that any proposal that doesn't have faculty consultation will be troublesome. Vice Provost and Senator Burd added that not everyone will have been consulted as broadly as possible before October 13th, but that any proposals going forward will have plentiful opportunities for wide conversation and consultation.

Senator Witte asked whether a blog publishing tool could be established on the Provost's website; such an effort could reassure faculty of the opportunity to offer input at even this earliest stage. Members posting comments could be required to sign their names. No responses and no editing would be needed. Provost Hay agreed to try to add a comment page for the proposals.

Senator Effken asked who among the state legislators should be contacted to encourage the JCCR to review the \$68M for building projects for the UA. President Shelton suggested contacting State Senator Robert Burns, Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2008**

The minutes of September 8, 2008 were approved with one redundancy deletion.

6. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM NEW OFFICE OF COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION IN THE LIBRARY (attachments)**

The University Copyright Office Director Dan Lee distributed "copyright slider charts" to Senators. The sliders are a tool to determine copyright protections based on publication dates. The devices were designed by a member of UA library staff and are produced by the American Librarian Association. With the support of the Vice President for Instruction and the Vice President for Research, the Library was able to open a new office of Copyright Management and Scholarly Communication this summer. Its purpose is to provide campus-wide education and to promote policies and practices that achieve broad access to consulting advice on copyright issues related to scholarship and research. The office is currently working on three issues: 1) The NIH Public Access Policy which requires NIH-funded researchers to make electronic versions of their final, peer-reviewed manuscripts available on the Web within twelve months of publication. 2) The Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences Vote for Open Access. This was a faculty vote conducted last spring to make their peer-reviewed publications available on the Web; Harvard's Law School faculty and Stanford's School of Education soon followed suit. The UC System has been considering such an action for some time and in 2005, the UA Faculty Senate endorsed a statement encouraging faculty to move in the direction of the Harvard faculty's action. 3) This past spring, Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press, and Sage Publications sued Georgia State University for copyright infringement based on faculty's and administrators' electronic reserve service and course management system activities. It is hoped that the courts will settle fair use and course-related publishing.

7. **ICPC CONSENT AGENDA FORWARDED AS SECONDED MOTIONS BY THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE (attachments)**

The two consent agenda items forwarded by the ICPC and detailed at the end of these minutes [Motions 2008/09-1, 2008/09-2] were approved unanimously. Senator Silverman reminded Senators that during an earlier UA reorganization process, one of the main proposals was to eliminate the Department of Journalism. That elimination did not occur and the Department of Journalism has clearly prospered under the leadership of Jacqueline Sharkey and others. As the UA enters this Transformation process, Senator Silverman encouraged everyone to remember this account.

8. **ICPC NON-CONSENT AGENDA FORWARDED AS SECONDED MOTIONS BY THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE (attachments)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell reminded the Senate that the non-consent agenda items still come as seconded motions from the ICPC, but because they are dealing with policy, they are not offered as Consent Agenda items. ICPC Chair Conway informed the Senate that the proposed change to the policy on Class Standing/Classification and Time to Declare a Major [Motion 2008/09-3] will standardize the current variable policy among colleges. Senators' questions and comments included the following: 1) Will this change have a negative effect on disadvantaged students who cannot take a full load because they must work to pay tuition? ICPC Chair Conway said no particular group has been singled out in the discussion, but research indicates that students taking fifteen units or more have better success at the University. 2) Is this strategy in the best interests of the University's disadvantaged and underprepared students, particularly while the institution is struggling to raise its retention rates? 3) Is the increase in state-awarded funding when students enroll for fifteen units driving this approach? 4) The research that indicates that students taking a full load do better does not include students with disabilities. This requirement is unreasonable for many such students who will require substantially more support services to enroll in fifteen units. ICPC Chair Conway explained that advancing class standings merely affects students' registration priorities, and will not negatively impact any populations otherwise. Vice Provost Burd added that students carrying a full load are more engaged in the University and this helps them to graduate. Honors students and students with disabilities are allowed priority registration anyway. The important issue is to move the students forward and to help them graduate on time. 5) Standardizing this classification may not provide the best opportunities for disadvantaged or disabled students, or for students who will be prevented from taking more advanced courses to diversify their curriculum. 6) Has anyone considered the effect of this change on the potential increase in the size of General Education courses that these students need? 7) Chair of the Faculty Howell explained that this policy change will not disadvantage anyone; the change is simply a policy that primarily focuses on who registers when. 8) If the only real purpose is for the order of registration, what does the University do now, and what message does this change send to our students? ICPC

Chair Conway explained that some colleges have different unit requirements; 1-24 units is common for freshman standing in most colleges, but that number can vary to as much as 1-30 for Law or 1-29 for Architecture. Beyond the freshman year, most colleges' increments are by 30 units. The primary change therefore, will standardize freshman standing to be 1-30 throughout the University. 9) It is unclear what the implications of changing the class standing may mean for students; colleges with differing requirements decided on those requirements for a reason. Furthermore, some scholarships are linked to status and may be based on attaining sophomore or junior standing within a certain length of time. 10) ASUA President Bruce spoke in favor of the change, noting that the change really only affects whether freshmen register during weeks 1, 2, or 3. This policy change and the message it sends helps to emphasize "Finish in Four" and should help future students to graduate in a more timely manner. 11) It appears that this policy change could work to disadvantage University College students, so perhaps the Senate should delay voting until University College Director Sylvia Mioduski and University College Dean Juan Garcia can address the Senate. Senator Willerton moved [Motion 2008/09-4] to postpone voting on Motion 2008/09-3 until the next Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Presiding Officer Mitchell recognized Celeste Pardee, Curriculum Associate from the Office of Academic Affairs, who pointed out that S. Mioduski was attending Undergraduate Council meetings when this policy change was discussed. The change actually provides more time (an additional three units) for undecided students to declare a major. Ms. Pardee further explained that S. Mioduski's concerns were dealt with by acknowledging that advisors will continue to recommend the correct number of courses for each individual student regardless of class standing. 12) Although a number of questions are being raised today, this policy change has been vetted extensively by the appropriate faculty committees. Motion to postpone voting on Motion 2008/09-3 to approve the standardization of class standings/classifications and time to declare failed 10-32-0. Motion 2008/09-3 to approve the change to class standing/classification and time to declare a major passed.

ICPC Chair Conway explained that the second non-consent item [Motion 2008/09-5] is to create a Military Leave of Absence policy to allow students who are military personnel and are called to active duty to return to school within one year of their return from duty without paying additional fees or having to be readmitted. It is felt that this policy is more appropriate for our military personnel than the current undergraduate leave of absence, which is two semesters. Senator Gruener moved [Motion 2008/09-6] to close debate on Motion 2008/09-5. Motion was seconded and passed. Motion 2008/09-5 to create a military leave of absence policy passed.

ICPC Chair Conway advised the Senate of an information item that has already been approved at the state level, which reserves the right for the University to verify that a community college general education curriculum has been fulfilled.

9. **INFORMATION ITEM: NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION ACCREDITATION REVIEW (attachments)**

Dr. Randy Richardson, Co-Director of the North Central Association (NCA) Accreditation 2010 Process informed the Senate that his co-director, Senator Beth Mitchneck, is out of the country at this time. Dr. Richardson described his involvement in the NCA Accreditation effort ten years ago. With strong support from Provost Hay and President Shelton, Dr. Richardson is pleased to be involved again, this time in a forward-looking process that will identify a limited number of action items. Accreditation reviews provide a University-wide opportunity for the institution to closely examine itself. This process began in Spring 2008 and will not obstruct or replace the UA Transformation efforts. The NCA is particularly interested in the future and how the institution will confront the 21st century in a fast-evolving environment for higher education. Dr. Richardson's handouts included the NCA's five criteria for accreditation evaluation and a draft "UA Vision for NCA Accreditation." Drs. Richardson and Mitchneck have already met with thirteen deans about these criteria. Dr. Richardson said the process is going to be transparent and that periodic reports will be made to the Senate. The NCA Site Visit is scheduled for Fall 2010. Dr. Richardson asked for the Senate's feedback on the proposed working teams' structure for the process and for suggestions of forward-thinking faculty members for each of the working teams to be sent to him at rmr@email.arizona.edu. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) For a land-grant university, the concept of "engagement" should be integral across the three legs of teaching/learning, research, and service. Dr. Richardson noted that some of the early discussions have been about globalization, cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary efforts and reducing impediments to them. 2) This is a stimulating and forward-looking presentation and effort. 3) Another important area to be considered is "ignoramics" which is how students are being taught about what is still unknown and uncertain. 4) Will student learning be assessed? Dr. Richardson acknowledged that the professional schools are much better at assessing student learning, because that assessment is so integral to their accreditation cycles, which are seven rather than ten years. The broader, non-professional schools aren't as effective at assessing learning, although one thing is certain; testing isn't the primary way to determine who is learning. President Shelton thanked Drs. Richardson and Mitchneck for their insights and perspective in launching this forward-looking self-examination.

10. **DISCUSSION: UA TRANSFORMATION PLAN (attachments)**

Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell noted with a local political cartoon, that the wider Tucson community is watching the UA Transformation. She displayed the UA Transformation Timeline that is posted on the Provost's website. Chair Howell corrected a misperception that exists on campus; the white paper proposals are due on October 13th, but not every person in the affected units will necessarily have been consulted, nor will it be possible to consult everyone prior to submitting the white paper. Rather the UA Transformation timeline allows for six weeks to complete the consultative process beginning November 3rd through December 15th. Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee Chair Miranda Joseph displayed the roster of the SPBAC

Transformation Subcommittee and a draft of a “SPBAC White Paper Evaluation Form” to guide the subcommittee in vetting each proposal. This evaluation form correlates with the criteria that the proposals’ creators were asked to address in their white papers. She explained that the subcommittee will specifically be looking at the extent of consultation to date and will allow for grass-roots proposals that haven’t yet had time to gather much support. The Shared Governance Review Committee has asked that the subcommittee make a report to the full SPBAC committee prior to forwarding its recommendations to the President and Provost. The subcommittee will look at the proposals in stages, beginning with the structural, higher-level reorganizations followed by mergers, curricular and other kinds of changes. While Dr. Joseph and the subcommittee understand the need to move quickly, they will not rush thoughtful deliberation in the process. Senators’ comments and questions included: 1) How will the recommendations be shared with the Provost and will they be shared with the campus community? Dr. Joseph responded that the SPBAC subcommittee has been asked to provide a one-page summary for each proposal, with overlapping proposals grouped. The SPBAC recommendations will probably be able to be shared, although perhaps not immediately. 2) How will the subcommittee deal with conflicting ideas? Dr. Joseph assured the Senate that the subcommittee understands that there will be conflicting ideas and that part of its job is sorting those out through extensive discussion. 3) Is it accurate to say that every unit will be involved in a reorganization? Chair Howell said that is not the case. 4) Is it accurate to say that only one proposal will be allowed per unit? Provost Hay answered that she prefers not to place any limitations, but she hopes that a unit with multiple proposals will consult widely among its members before December 15th to gather consensus on its proposal(s). 5) How can the subcommittee accomplish the sequencing and reviewing of the proposals in a mere two and a half weeks? Dr. Joseph said the subcommittee will try, but will not hesitate to ask for more time if needed. 6) Perhaps the subcommittee should consider employing the decision-making process that has been developed by UA faculty member Jay Nunamaker, Jr., which is being used globally. Dr. Joseph responded that the subcommittee is not making decisions, just recommendations. Any restructuring of academic programs will ultimately be voted on by the Faculty Senate. 7) There doesn’t seem to be any reference in the white paper requirements to the SPBAC criteria by which these proposals will be evaluated. Dr. Joseph and Provost Hay responded that the criteria are clearly stated on the call for proposals and that the website with the instructions for submission of white papers has an area which specifically asks for these criteria to be addressed. 8) Is it accurate to say that the deans were told that they could submit three-page proposals? Vice Provost Burd responded that the deans’ white papers will be held to the same requirements as everyone else. 9) Students are very interested in and want to be involved in the transformation efforts. 10) Regarding the consultative process, how can the subcommittee be sure that faculty are being consulted? In the College of Medicine, the dean has yet to call a faculty meeting or to give faculty an opportunity to see what is coming forward from the college officially. Furthermore, the COM administration disavowed a grass roots white paper that came forward from a group of faculty. Chair Howell responded that Provost Hay has made it clear that any deans’ proposals that do not include the process for faculty consultation will not be accepted. President Shelton emphasized that this will not be the only opportunity for faculty input, although some faculty have already been involved in the transformation process at this earliest stage. For proposals that will advance to the next phase, SPBAC, the President, and the Provost will ensure that all constituencies are involved. 11) Habitually, in some colleges, there has been too little faculty involvement, too much middle management and too much heavy-handedness in what is coming forward. All proposals, and particularly those that deal with restructuring, should include faculty involvement. 12) Despite everyone’s best intentions, significant portions of the faculty will be unrepresented in the consultative process. Therefore, a blog website should be created to allow for faculty’s substantive comments and sentiments to go on the record. Furthermore, both SPBAC and the Provost’s office should make it a point to read and track every comment. Provost Hay confirmed that a comment website will be available. 13) It would be helpful if faculty could be assured that all proposals will receive a fair vetting based on their merits, regardless of whether they are coming from a dean or just a couple of faculty members. Provost Hay affirmed that proposals will be reviewed without regard to the identities of the proposers. She also stressed that there will be zero tolerance for negative repercussions levied against anyone who submits a proposal. Dr. Joseph added that anyone with a proposal should simply advise their dean and send in their proposal. There are no “official” versus “non-official proposals” in this process. 14) How will the subcommittee deal with conflicting proposals? Dr. Joseph said that conflicting proposals will be noted in the SPBAC summaries, but negotiations among the members of the affected units will have to be worked out in the next stage. 15) If only one proposal comes forward from a college, how will the reviewers validate that faculty input occurred? Chair Howell admitted that it will be unfortunate if no faculty consultation has occurred, but for any proposals selected to advance to the next stage, there can be *no* denial of faculty dialogue. Provost Hay added that faculty buy-in is crucial to the process and the “Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals” require a 75% consensus among affected faculty to go forward without triggering an elaborate Faculty Senate committee process. Obviously any proposal that hasn’t been widely discussed with faculty is going to fail. 16) For a proposal that doesn’t involve merging two or more units, how will faculty, staff and student input be validated? Provost Hay said that the instructions for proposals require a description of the consultation process indicating which individuals or groups of faculty, staff, appointed professionals and students have been consulted. 17) How will the Senate’s “Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals” be applied to proposals that don’t involve the movement of faculty to different units? Chair Howell said she anticipates this kind of proposal and will ask the Senate at its November meeting to consider how the “Guidelines” can be applied to address all kinds of proposals.

11. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

J.C. Mutchler, Secretary of the Faculty
Pamela S. Bridgmon, Recording Secretary

Appendix*

1. Consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee
2. Academic Calendars from 2010 to 2015
3. Non-consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to change the Class Standing/Classification System and Time to Declare a Major
4. Non-consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to create a Military Leave of Absence Policy
5. Informational Item forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee: Procedural amendment confirming the University's right to verify an Arizona General Education Curriculum
6. Summarized Accreditation Criteria for NCA 2010
7. Vision for NCA Accreditation 2010
8. Team Structure for the NCA 2010 Process
9. "Is it protected by Copyright" slide-chart
10. Arizona Article VIII HEARSAY - Rule 801 Definitions
11. Office of Copyright Management and Scholarly Communication help sheet
12. Overhead: SPBAC "Transformation" Subcommittee Roster
13. Overhead: Transformation timeline (2 pgs)
14. Overhead: SPBAC White Paper Evaluation Form

**Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.*

Motions of the Meeting of October 6, 2008

Motion 2008/09-1 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve changing the name of the Department of Journalism to the School of Journalism. Motion carried.

Motion 2008/09-2 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the Academic Calendars for the years 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15. Motion carried.

Motion 2008/09-3 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve changing the Class Standing/Classification System to be 30 units -sophomore, 60 units -junior, and 90 units -senior and Time to Declare a Major to be 60 units. Motion carried.

Motion 2008/09-4 Seconded motion to postpone Motion 2008/09-3 until the next Faculty Senate meeting. Motion failed.

Motion 2007/08-5 Seconded motion to create a Military Leave of Absence Policy to allow students who are called to active duty a leave of absence for the period of plus up to one year after returning from active duty. Motion carried.

Motion 2008/09-6 Seconded motion to close debate on Motion 2008-09-5. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO Box 210473